

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 23, 2003 with claims 1-21. Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 21 are pending with claim 1 the pending independent claim.

In the Advisory Action dated September 24, 2007, incorporating by reference the final Office Action dated August 9, 2007, the Examiner indicated claims 1-3, 7-10, and 21 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,890,150 to Ushijima et al. (hereinafter “Ushijima”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,604 to Acharya et al. (hereinafter “Acharya”) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,202 issued to Kon (hereinafter “Kon”); and claim 4 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ushijima, Acharya and Kon in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0167259 to Casson et al. (hereinafter “Casson”).

Applicants have submitted herewith a Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR §1.114 along with the fee under 37 CFR §1.17(e). Thus, Applicants respectfully request that prosecution be reopened and that the present amendments be entered. Applicants moreover request reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Applicants have amended the claims without prejudice solely to clarify the subject matter which the Applicants claim as their invention. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the query results comprise the one or more target attributes and one or more auxiliary attributes, wherein the one or more auxiliary attributes are not included in the query. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at, for example, page 4, lines 9-15; and page 5, lines 15-25; and page 6, lines 23-25.

Moreover, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 7-9 have been amended so as to remove limitations requiring the determination of a relative selectivity for each of the one or more target attributes, as well as the one or more auxiliary attributes. Applicants respectfully submit that the determination of a relative selectivity for each of the one or more target attributes is not required in order to append the query with at least one new predicate corresponding to at least one of the one or more auxiliary attributes having a high relative selectivity to form a rewritten query and, as such, is not essential to the claimed method.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references of record teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1, as amended, wherein the one or more auxiliary attributes are present in the query results but not in the query. In formulating the present rejection of claim 1, the Examiner argues that limitations relating to the use of auxiliary attributes are disclosed in the combined teachings of Ushijima at column 7, line 47, to column 8, line 5; Acharya at column 11, lines 39-44; and Kon at column 3, lines 28-39.

Applicants respectfully submit that the relied-upon portion of Ushijima describes results shown in FIGS. 12-14 wherein various columns are grouped and/or aggregated based on the query statement shown in the specification at column 7, lines 5-27, and discussed in the specification at column 7, lines 28-47. In the final Office Action at page 3, lines 3-5, the Examiner specifically mentions UNIT_PRICE, ORDER NO, and ORDER AMOUNT. However, as is clearly shown in lines 1 and 2 of the query statement, corresponding to the specification of Ushijima at column 7, lines 8-10, each of the columns which are grouped and/or aggregated are explicitly included in the query. As such, Ushijima contains no teachings or suggestions regarding auxiliary attributes included in the query results but not in the query, as recited in claim 1.

The relied-upon portion of Acharya teaches a technique wherein a query is rewritten so as to include a sum_error() function, which is described as encapsulating an error formula for a sum aggregate. Applicants respectfully submit that the sum_error() function is not an auxiliary attribute included in the query results but not in the query. Rather, with reference to FIG. 3, the sum_error function shown in the rewritten query takes as input the l_quantity field recited in the original query.

Finally, the “missing attribute” taught in Kon fails to teach or suggest the auxiliary attribute recited in claim 1. Rather, the “missing attribute” taught by Kon refers to an attribute which is not present in the query results (or, for that matter, the data set). See Kon at, for example, column 1, lines 33-34; column 2, lines 5-8; and column 3, lines 21-31.

Accordingly, it is believed that the combined teachings of Ushijima, Acharya and Kon fail to meet the limitations of claim 1 as amended. As such, Applicants assert that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Ushijima, Acharya and Kon.

Attorney Docket No. YOR920030366US1

Dependent claims 2-4, 7-10 and 21 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-4, 7-10 and 21 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 31, 2007

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946